

June 10, 2002

Mr. Cary L. Bovey Law Offices of Cary L. Bovey 600 Round Rock West Drive, Suite 603 Round Rock, Texas 78681

OR2002-3099

Dear Mr. Bovey:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 164058.

The City of Bartlett (the "city") received a request for a copy of a specified complaint, as well as copies of all other documents concerning the complaint. You state that the city will release a redacted copy of the complaint to the requestor. You claim, however, that the redacted information from the complaint is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and have reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor. See Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we address the requestor's contention that the city maintains information that is responsive to the remaining portions of the request. We note that the city states that no other information exists in the city's records that would be responsive to the remaining portions of the request. We also note that our office cannot resolve disputes of fact in the open records process, and therefore, must rely on the representations of the governmental body requesting our opinion. See Open Records Decision Nos. 554 (1990), 552 (1990). Consequently, based on the city's representation that no other information exists that would be responsive to the remaining portions of the request, we cannot resolve the requestor's claim.

You claim that the redacted information from the complaint is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> We note that it is implicit in several provisions of the Public Information Act (the "Act") that the Act applies only to information already in existence. See Gov't Code §§ 552.002, .021, .227, .351. The Act does not require a governmental body to prepare new information in response to a request. See Attorney General Opinion H-90 (1973); see also Open Records Decision Nos. 87 (1975), 342 at 3 (1982), 416 at 5 (1984), 452 at 2-3 (1986), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 572 at 1 (1990). A governmental body must only make a good faith effort to relate a request to information which it holds. See Open Records Decision No. 561 at 8 (1990).

informer's privilege.<sup>2</sup> The common-law informer's privilege has long been recognized by Texas courts and is incorporated into the Public Information Act by section 552.101. See Aguilar v. State, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); see also Hawthorne v. State, 10 S.W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided that the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. See Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1988), 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer's privilege also protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." See Open Records Decision No. 279 at 2 (1981) (citing Wigmore, Evidence, § 2374, at 767 (McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute carrying a civil or criminal penalty. See Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4-5 (1988).

You state that the information at issue reflects that a particular complainant reported possible violations of building standards which have been adopted by the city. We note, however, that the requestor has submitted information to our office which reflects that she knows the identity of the informer in this instance. Accordingly, we conclude that the city may not withhold the redacted information from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. See Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1988), 208 at 1-2 (1978). Consequently, the city must release the redacted information consisting of the informer's identity to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by the common-law informer's privilege.

statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

Ronald J. Bounds

Rosed J. Bounds

Assistant Attorney General Open Records Division

RJB/seg

Ref:

ID# 164058

Enc.

Submitted documents

cc:

Ms. Carolyn Logan

2409 South Old Bastrop Highway San Marcos, Texas 78666-8973

(w/o enclosures)